UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,355	04/06/2000	James A. McKeeth	MPATENT.164A	8050

24504 7590 02/08/2006

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER	
HU, JINSONG	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/544,355	MCKEETH, JAMES A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jinsong Hu	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 November 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *29-56* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *29-56* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 29-56 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 29-56 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreke et al. (US 6,463,471) in view of Aravamudan et al. (US 6,301,609).

4. As per claims 29 and 38, Dreke teaches the invention as claimed including a method for updating Domain Name System (DNS) information in response to a change in client status, the method comprising the steps of:

receiving a client request to update DNS information on a DNS server, the client being subscribed to a domain name [col. 2, lines 53-55; col. 4, lines 3-6 & 60-66];

on receipt of the client request, assigning an IP address to the client and updating an entry in an IP address table on the DNS server such that the domain name corresponds with the assigned IP address [col. 4, line 60-65]; and

determining a client status of on-line or off-line [col. 4, lines 33-39].

5. Dreke does not specifically teach responsive to off-line determination, updating the IP address table on the DNS server such that the domain name corresponds with an interactive file. However, Aravamudan on the other hand teaches responsive to off-line determination, updating the IP address table on the DNS server such that the domain name corresponds with an interactive file [col. 8, lines 19-31]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Dreke and Aravamudan because doing so would enable the server to have the accurate status information of users. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Dreke's system with Aravamudan's updated status of users to increase the integrity of the system.

6. As per claims 30 and 31, Aravamudan teaches the interactive file comprises a first web page that is configured to provide information to the first client and configured to allow the first client to leave a message for the second client [col. 7, lines 21-40; i.e., the second user be able to access certain file or webpage of first user to leave the messages].

7. As per claims 32 and 39, Aravamudan teaches the second web page includes at least one of messages received while client was off- line, a time of last log-on by client, or a duration the client was off-line [col. 8, lines 44-55].

8. As per claims 33 and 40, Aravamudan teaches determining if the client is authorized to administer the domain name [col. 1, lines 59-62].

9. As per claims 34-35, Dreke and Aravamudan teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 29. Both references do not teach the step of processing request and notifying the client that the request has been processed. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made include these steps because doing so would bring convenience to user by allowing the user being acknowledged once the request being processed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the combination system of Dreke and Aravamudan system to benefit user.

10. As per claims 36 and 37, Dreke teaches the step of monitoring arrival of a signal that is periodically transmitted by the first client, the arrival of the signal indicating that the status of the first client is on-line [col. 4, lines 37-44].

11. As per claims 41-49, since they are program claims of claims 29-37, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 29-37 above.

12. As per claims 50-56, since they are system claims of claims 29 and 32-36, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 29 and 32-36 above.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/2/05 for claims 29-56 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that

(1) Neither Dreke nor Aravamudan teaches the step of receiving a client request to update DNS information on a DNS server;

(2) Neither Dreke nor Aravamudan teaches the client being subscribed to a domain name;

(3) Neither Dreke nor Aravamudan teaches the step of updating the IP address table on the DNS server such that the domain name corresponds with an interactive file;

(4) Neither Dreke nor Aravamudan teaches the interactive file comprises a first web page that is configured to provide information to the first client and configured to allow the first client to leave a message for the second client.

14. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's remarks:

A. As to point (1), applicant fails to consider the teaching of the Dreke's reference for assigning different IP address by Internet Provider [i.e., DNS server] to a user each time when he/she logs on the Internet [i.e., request to update DNS information, such as receiving a new IP address]. Thus, Dreke is still a relevant prior art reference. Furthermore, Examiner did not rely on Aravamudan's reference to reject this limitation in the previous office action, the argument for Aravamudan not teaching the step of receiving a client request to update DNS information on a DNS server is improper. Therefore, the rejection is still maintained.

B. As per to point (2), applicant fails to consider the teaching of the

Dreke's reference for providing service to the register users [col. 2, lines 23-25] and the user being able to receiving a newly network address [col. 4, lines 3-6 & 60-66], i.e., the client being subscribed to a domain name. Thus, Dreke is still a relevant prior art reference. Furthermore, even the Examiner did not rely on Aravamudan's reference to reject this limitation in the previous office action, Aravamudan's reference discloses the client being subscribed to a domain name [col. 3, lines 37-41]. Therefore, the rejection is still maintained.

C. As to point (3), applicant fails to consider the teaching of Aravamudan's reference for delivering pending events to the user when he/she logs on the network again [col. 7, lines 33-40], i.e., updating the IP address table on the DNS server such that the domain name corresponds with an interactive file. Thus, Aravamudan is still a relevant prior art reference. Furthermore, Examiner did not rely on Dreke's reference to reject this limitation in the previous office action, the argument for Dreke's reference is improper. Therefore, the rejection is still maintained.

D. As to point (4), applicant fails to consider the teaching of Aravamudan's reference for delivering a webpage by the first user to the second user even when the first user is off-line [col. 7, lines 6-13], i.e., a first web page that is configured to provide information to the first client and configured to allow the first client to leave a message for the second client [col. 7, lines 21-40; i.e., a first web page is configured to provide information to the first client and configured to allow the first client to leave a message for the second client. Thus, Aravamudan is still a relevant prior art reference. Furthermore, Examiner did not rely on Dreke's reference to reject this limitation in the

previous office action, the argument for Dreke's reference is improper. Therefore, the rejection is still maintained.

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

16. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jinsong Hu

February 3, 2006

VIET D. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER